

①

Research Note 88-17

DTIC SELECTE

The Army Communications Objectives Measurement System (ACOMS): "Tour of Duty" Viewing Patterns

James B. Greenlees
Westat, Inc.

AD-A199 497



DTIC
SELECTE
SEP 21 1988
E



U.S. Army Research Institute
for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

August 1988

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

AD-A199497

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified			1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS ---		
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY ---			3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE ---					
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) 945269			5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) ARI Research Note 88-17		
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Westat, Inc.		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) ---		7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences	
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 1650 Research Blvd. Rockville, MD 20850			7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333-5600		
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION ---		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) ---		9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER MDA903-85-C-0414	
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) ---			10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS		
			PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. 6.37.31	PROJECT NO 2Q263731 A792	TASK NO. 2.2.1
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) The Army Communications Objectives Measurement System (ACOMS): "Tour of Duty" Viewing Patterns					
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) James B. Greenlees					
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Interim		13b. TIME COVERED FROM 87/10 TO 87/12		14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1988, August	15. PAGE COUNT 19
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Timothy W. Elig and Michael E. Benedict were Contracting Officer's Repre- sentatives. Contract work was requested and funded by the Directorate of Program Analysis and Evaluation, U.S. Army Recruiting Command, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel.					
17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)		
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	Advertising recall Intent to enlist Perceptions ACOMS		
05	09	---	Army advertising Market segments Regular viewers		
05	08	---	Importance Media habits Tour of duty		
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) This report summarizes analyses conducted on patterns of watching the television show "Tour of Duty" among respondents to the Army Communications Objectives Measurement System (ACOMS) survey who were interviewed in the fifth quarter of data collection (October-December 1987). Analyses were conducted both on all respondents asked questions on their media habits and on those who watched more than the average number of hours of television per week. Differences between respondents who did and did not watch the program were assessed by market segment, recall of Army advertising, perceptions of Army attributes, intent to enlist and enlistment- related behaviors, and importance of Army attributes. The ACOMS survey was a multiyear telephone survey of a nationally representative sample of 16- to 24-year-old American youth and their parents. The survey was designed to track changes in perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors relevant to Army advertising. Data was collected continuously through the year, using computer-assisted-telephone-interviewing (CATI) technology. Random digit dialing (RDD), involving a modified Waksberg method, was (Continued)					
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT. <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS			21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified		
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Timothy W. Elig			22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) 202/274-5610	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL PERI-RG	

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

ARI Research Note 88-17

19. Abstract (Continued)

used to identify eligible respondents. The 30-minute interview asked youth about their responses to Army advertising, media habits, career plans, and various demographic characteristics. _

Other related reports are identified as follows:

Technical Reports (TR) 784, 785, and 787

Research Report (RR) 1473

Research Products (RP) 88-04, 88-05, 88-06, 88-07, and 88-08

Research Note (RN) 88-18

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
and/or	
Special	
A-1	



UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

**The Army Communications Objectives
Measurement System (ACOMS):
"Tour of Duty" Viewing Patterns**

James B. Greenlees

Westat, Inc.

for

Contracting Officer's Representatives

Timothy W. Elig and Michael E. Benedict

Manpower and Personnel Policy Research Group

Curtis L. Gilroy, Chief

Manpower and Personnel Research Laboratory

Newell K. Eaton, Director

U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333-5600

Office, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel

Department of the Army

August 1988

Army Project Number
2Q263731A792

Manpower and Personnel

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Project Staff for the Period Reported (October 1987-December 1987)

Army Special Advisory Group, Staff Officers, and Special Advisors:

LTC Terry White (Chair) (ODCSPER); LTC Jesse Brokenburr, Gerald Klopp, CPT(P) Douglas McLiverty, CPT John Perry (USAREC); LTC Al Resnick, MAJ Thomas Loggie (USAROTCCC); LTC Rockwell, LTC Jesse Wall, MAJ Harry Simpson (OCAR); SGM Gene Wallace (ARNG); Zahava Doering, Michael Laurence, Vonda Kiplinger (DMDC); Paul Gade, Curtis Gilroy (ARI).

ARI Project Staff:

Michael Benedict, Timothy Elig, Allyn Herzbach, Naomi Verdugo.

Westat Project Staff:

Veronica F. Nieva, Gregory H. Gaertner, Michael D. Rhoads, Joseph Waksberg, Michael J. Wilson, Bruce F. Allen, Sandra Baxter, Jansen B. Davis, Richard C. Dulaney, Susan M. Englehart, Nancy L. Gay, James B. Greenlees, Edward Hoke, Catherine C. Howard, Jan Hull, Linda J. Keil, Dori Kriesberg, David Lincoln, Robin McEntire, Leyla Mohadjer, Karen Molloy, Carin N. Rauch, Steve Roey, Jeannie Whalen, Data Preparation Staff, Secretarial Staff, Telephone Center Management and Interviewers.

THE ARMY COMMUNICATIONS OBJECTIVES MEASUREMENT SYSTEM (ACOMS): "TOUR OF DUTY"
VIEWING PATTERNS

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
METHODOLOGY	1
RESULTS	2
Monitoring by Market Segment	2
Recall of Army Advertising	4
Perceptions of Army Attributes	4
Intent to Enlist and Enlistment-Related Behaviors	7
Importance of Army Attributes	7
Summary and Discussion	10
Reference	12

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Percentage viewing "Tour of Duty" for market segments of Primary Male Analytic Sample (PMAS) youth and regular television viewers	3
2. Percentage with no recall, aided recall, and unaided recall of Army advertising among Primary Male Analytic Sample (PMAS) youth and regular television viewers who do and do not watch "Tour of Duty"	5
3. Percentage watching and not watching "Tour of Duty" who agree with active Army attribute statements for Primary Male Analytic Sample (PMAS) youth and regular viewers	6
4. Percentage watching and not watching "Tour of Duty" who express intent to join active Army and/or have taken enlistment-related actions for Primary Male Analytic Sample (PMAS) youth and regular viewers	8
5. Percentage watching and not watching "Tour of Duty" who agree that attributes are important for Primary Male Analytic Sample (PMAS) youth and regular viewers	9

THE ARMY COMMUNICATIONS OBJECTIVES MEASUREMENT SYSTEM (ACOMS):
"TOUR OF DUTY" VIEWING PATTERNS

Introduction

This report summarizes the analyses conducted on patterns of watching the television show "Tour of Duty" among respondents to the Army Communications Objectives Measurement System (ACOMS) survey who were interviewed in the fifth quarter of ACOMS data collection. The Army expressed interest in this program dealing with the Vietnam War, and how watching it related to respondents' views of the Army and their enlistment intentions.

Methodology

During Fall Quarter 1987 (1 October through 31 December), computer-assisted 30-minute telephone interviews were conducted with 3,258 youth between the ages of 16 and 24. Youth were asked about their education and employment history, career plans, intentions to enlist in the Army, enlistment-related activities undertaken during the prior six months, and what opportunities they regarded as important to their future plans. They were also asked about their media habits, recall of military advertising, knowledge and perceptions of the Army and its components, and their attitudes toward Army advertisements. Demographic information was also collected.

Analyses presented in this paper focus on the Primary Male Analytic Sample (PMAS) of ACOMS. The PMAS corresponds to the primary enlisted market and consists of males who have neither served nor been accepted for service in the military; who are either in high school or have a regular high school diploma; who have never taken a college Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) course; and who have not yet completed their sophomore year in college. For the Fall Quarter 1987, this resulted in a sample of 2,087 PMAS youth.

In order to replicate the discussion of television and radio programs and stations contained in Chapter 7 of the ACOMS Annual Interpretive Report (Greenlees & Gaertner, 1988), results are presented both for all PMAS youth asked questions concerning media habits ($n=1043$), and for those considered regular television viewers ($n=366$). Following the logic used for that analysis, regular television viewers were defined as those who viewed more than the average number of hours per week for the PMAS. For Fall 1987, this meant that individuals viewing more than 11 hours of regular television per week were classified as "regular viewers". Due to the recency of the introduction of the program on television, and the relatively low number of respondents in some analytic categories (especially among regular viewers), significance tests utilized both the normal $p<.05$ and the less stringent $p<.10$ levels.

Approximately half of the PMAS youth were selected in the Fall 1987 quarter for the media habits module and were asked if they regularly monitored various media, resulting in a media habits

subsample of 1059 PMAS youth. Unless these youth reported no time monitoring the medium in question, they were then asked about their preferences in programming and content. For the Fall 1987 quarter, the Army requested that the youth be asked about a new television show, "Tour of Duty". Thus, the final option to the question, "Please tell me if you watch any of the following TV shows regularly. Do you watch..." was, "Tour of Duty?". Respondents indicating they watched no television were assumed not to have watched "Tour of Duty" regularly.

Results

Of PMAS youth, 19.2% reported that they "regularly" viewed "Tour of Duty". This proportion is roughly the same for regular television viewers; of these, 20.6% reported "regularly" viewing the show (Table 1). These proportions are well below the proportions of youth regularly viewing television shows on which the Army regularly advertises (Greenlees & Gaertner, 1988). Reasons for low viewing levels are discussed below. Hours per week watching commercial television by PMAS youth is significantly correlated with watching "Tour of Duty" ($r=.083$, $p<.10$). This correlation is not significant for regular viewers, possibly due to the elimination from consideration of all respondents who watch fewer than 11 hours of commercial television per week. For the full sample, then, it appears that those who watch a great deal of television are also more likely to watch "Tour of Duty".

Monitoring by Market Segment

In the remainder of Table 1, monitoring levels are displayed by education, region (as defined by U.S. Army Recruiting Command (USAREC) recruiting brigade), age, race, and ethnicity. Significant differences among market segments were found only for education among the full PMAS sample ($\chi^2=6.42$, $p<.10$). Monitoring levels were highest among work-oriented high school students, with 31.6% watching the program. This was also the highest-monitoring category among regular viewers, with 39.3% watching, but the differences by education group were not significant. There were no significant regional differences in monitoring either for the sample as a whole or for regular viewers.

The possibility was raised that the small number of "Other" respondents was suppressing significant results by race, so the analysis was reconducted three different ways. First, all respondents classified as "Other" were recoded as White for both the full sample ($\chi^2=2.62$, n.s.), and for regular viewers ($\chi^2=1.45$, n.s.). They were then recoded as Black (full-sample $\chi^2=2.46$, n.s.; regular viewers $\chi^2=1.92$, n.s.). Finally, analysis was conducted on Whites and Blacks only (full-sample $\chi^2=2.70$, n.s.; regular viewers $\chi^2=1.63$, n.s.). The small number of respondents with race coded as "Other", then, did not adversely influence significance testing.

Table 1

Percentage Viewing "Tour of Duty" for Market Segments of Primary Male Analytic Sample (PMAS) Youth and Regular Television Viewers

Market	Full Sample	Number Responding	Regular Viewers	Number Responding
Total	19.2	1043	20.6	359
College Fresh./Soph.	15.9	198	15.1	50
College-Oriented HS	20.6	424	19.9	168
Work-Oriented HS	31.6	94	39.3	32
High School Graduates not Currently Enrolled	17.3	335	19.7	113
$\chi^2(3)$	6.42*		4.33	
1st Rctg Bde-NE	19.3	285	21.0	110
2nd Rctg Bde-SE	22.7	156	32.0	53
4th Rctg Bde-MW	13.0	268	16.3	80
5th Rctg Bde-SW	17.9	195	15.4	75
6th Rctg Bde-W	17.9	147	15.4	45
$\chi^2(4)$	6.47		3.58	
16- to 17-yrs old	22.9	443	23.6	172
18- to 19-yrs old	15.8	316	16.2	99
20- to 21-yrs old	13.9	133	12.7	40
22- to 24-yrs old	22.1	159	27.8	52
$\chi^2(3)$	5.57		3.46	
White	20.5	901	22.9	302
Black	12.9	108	12.6	41
Other	17.7	34	14.8	16
$\chi^2(2)$	2.74		1.94	
Hispanic	17.4	102	14.5	39
Non-Hispanic	19.5	946	21.5	323
$\chi^2(1)$	0.16		0.59	

* $p < .10$.

Recall of Army Advertising

While the Army does not advertise on "Tour of Duty", the setting of the show may serve as a substitute for actual advertising and aid recall of Army advertising seen or heard elsewhere. For the purposes of this analysis, Army ad recall is divided into three levels:

- (1) No Recall. Respondent did not mention Army advertising and could not recall ads for the Army when asked directly;
- (2) Aided Recall. Youth responded positively when asked whether he had seen or heard advertising for the Army; and
- (3) Unaided Recall. Respondent offered the Army when asked whether he recalled having seen or heard military advertising.

Table 2 contains the percentages of PMAS youth and regular viewers with different levels of recall of Army ads among those who reported viewing "Tour of Duty" and among those who did not. For both the full PMAS and the regular television viewers, no significant differences in recall were found between those who reported regularly viewing "Tour of Duty" and those who did not. Whether or not a youth watches the program, then, does not seem associated with recall of Army advertising.

Perceptions of Army Attributes

A separate area of interest is whether perceptions of the Army differ between viewers and nonviewers. Responses to the 14 ACOMS questions measuring respondent perceptions of Army attributes were dichotomized into whether the respondent agreed that the Army exhibited each attribute or not. The percentages of viewers and nonviewers who agreed that the Army exhibits the various attributes are displayed in Table 3.

For the full PMAS, larger percentages of "Tour of Duty" viewers than nonviewers agreed that the Army offered each of the 14 perceptions. Significant differences were found for: aiding civilian career ($\chi^2=4.82$, $p<.05$); developing self-confidence ($\chi^2=6.90$, $p<.05$); high quality coworkers ($\chi^2=4.44$, $p<.05$); and mental challenge ($\chi^2=2.87$, $p<.10$). Among regular viewers, the same pattern existed for all of the perceptions except one: the Army offers a wide variety of opportunities ($\chi^2=2.36$, n.s.). Significant differences occurred for: working with high-tech equipment ($\chi^2=6.66$, $p<.05$); the Army as a proud experience ($\chi^2=3.00$, $p<.10$); developing self-confidence ($\chi^2=3.47$, $p<.10$); and that the Army provides useful skill training ($\chi^2=3.46$, $p<.10$). The implication here is that youth who watch "Tour of Duty" tend to hold a more positive image of the Army than do youth who do not watch the program. Further, since the differences are found for both regular television viewers and for the sample as a whole, overall

Table 2

Percentage With no Recall, Aided Recall, and Unaided Recall of Army Advertising among Primary Male Analytic Sample (PMAS) Youth and Regular Television Viewers Who Do and Do Not Watch "Tour of Duty"

	No Recall	Aided Recall	Unaided Recall	$\chi^2(2)$
Full Sample:				0.52
Watch	6.1	11.5	82.5	
Do Not Watch	5.3	9.6	85.1	
Regular Viewers:				0.58
Watch	4.7	6.4	88.8	
Do Not Watch	2.8	8.4	88.9	

Note. Results are based on 1043 respondents for full sample and 359 respondents for regular users.

Table 3

Percentage Watching and Not Watching "Tour of Duty" who Agree with Active Army Attribute Statements for Primary Male Analytic Sample (PMAS) Youth and Regular Viewers

Percentage Agree that the Army offers . . . (1)	Full Sample Who:			Regular Viewers Who:		
	Watch	Do Not Watch	χ^2 (1)	Watch	Do Not Watch	χ^2
Wide variety	59.8	53.5	1.35	67.8	75.6	2.36
Physical challenge	83.9	78.2	1.70	87.2	77.3	1.98
Proud experience	66.2	60.3	1.26	75.8	61.3	3.00*
Step to college	50.4	44.5	1.21	59.9	47.8	1.91
Leadership skills	72.2	68.9	0.45	78.5	69.9	1.18
High-tech equipment	81.3	75.0	1.89	89.5	69.6	6.66**
Aid to civilian career	60.5	48.7	4.82**	61.2	48.7	2.04
Chance to develop self-confidence	79.0	65.8	6.90**	79.6	64.3	3.47*
Chance to develop own potential	66.8	63.1	0.52	68.0	63.4	0.50
Mental challenge	71.3	62.6	2.87*	67.9	65.6	0.08
Chance to become more mature	77.0	70.8	1.64	83.2	72.9	1.85
Useful skill training	79.0	71.7	2.32	81.7	66.7	3.46*
High quality coworkers	78.5	68.2	4.44**	80.2	67.9	2.37
Money for education	78.6	76.1	0.31	79.8	77.9	0.07

Note. Results are based on 973 respondents for the full sample and 343 respondents for regular viewers. The difference in respondents from the other tables is due to Army perceptions not being asked of all respondents.

* $p < .10$. ** $p < .05$.

television viewing does not explain differences in attitude between "Tour of Duty" viewers and nonviewers.

Intent to Enlist and Enlistment-Related Behaviors

The top half of Table 4 presents aided and unaided intentions for viewers and nonviewers of "Tour of Duty", and shows more viewers than nonviewers intending to enlist for both the full PMAS and for regular television viewers. For the full PMAS, viewers and nonviewers showed significant differences in both unaided ($\chi^2=12.87$, $p<.05$) and aided ($\chi^2=17.16$, $p<.05$) intent to enlist, while among regular viewers, differences in unaided intent were significant ($\chi^2=3.36$, $p<.10$), while differences in aided intent were not.

Changing the focus slightly, 73.6% of full-sample respondents with unaided intention to enlist reported being regular watchers of "Tour of Duty", 35.9% with aided intent watched, while 16.5% of those who responded negatively to the aided intention question watched the program. Among regular television viewers, 66.8% of those with unaided intent, 25.7% with aided intent, and 19.7% of those coded "No" to aided intent, classified themselves as regular viewers.

The remainder of Table 4 displays rates of further enlistment-related behaviors taken by viewers and nonviewers. For the full PMAS, respondents who watch "Tour of Duty" were significantly more likely to visit an Army recruiting station ($\chi^2=4.67$, $p<.05$) than were respondents who did not report watching the program. No other differences were significant for either the full PMAS or regular television viewers.

These results seem to imply several things. First, intent to enlist is significantly higher among those who watch "Tour of Duty" than among those who do not. Second, if we think of unaided intent as showing stronger resolve to enlist than aided intent, viewing of the show seems to increase with intent. Finally, except in one case, watching the program does not seem to be an indicator of whether a respondent will take specific actions relating to enlistment.

Importance of Army Attributes

Associated with the questions discussed in relation to perceptions is whether respondent assessment of the importance of Army attributes differ between viewers and nonviewers. As was the case with active Army perceptions, responses to the ACOMS questions measuring the importance of 19 attributes were dichotomized into whether the respondent felt that each attribute was important or whether each was unimportant. Table 5 contains the percentages of "Tour of Duty" viewers and nonviewers who felt that the various attributes were important to them.

For the full PMAS, a larger percentage of viewers than nonviewers rated the attribute as important for 17 of the 19 attributes, with the other two attributes (serving in hometown and serving part-time)

Table 4

Percentage Watching and Not Watching "Tour of Duty" who Express Intent to Join Active Army and/or Have Taken Enlistment-Related Actions for Primary Male Analytic Sample (PMAS) Youth and Regular Viewers

	Full Sample Who:			Regular Viewers Who:		
	Watch	Do Not Watch	$\chi^2(1)$	Watch	Do Not Watch	$\chi^2(1)$
Unaided intent to enlist	4.2	0.4	12.87**	3.9	0.5	3.36*
Aided intent to enlist	26.6	11.6	17.16**	20.3	15.3	0.43
Talked to recruiter	17.2	12.8	1.51	14.4	18.3	0.37
Visited recruiting station	11.0	5.5	4.67**	13.0	8.3	0.92
Took test (e.g., ASVAB)	8.7	7.9	0.07	9.4	11.9	0.20

Note. Results are based on 1051 respondents for the full sample and 363 respondents for regular viewers.

* $p < .10$. ** $p < .05$.

Table 5

Percentage Watching and Not Watching "Tour of Duty" who Agree That Attributes are Important for Primary Male Analytic Sample (PMAS) Youth and Regular Viewers

Percentage Agree with the Importance of ...	Full Sample Who:			Regular Viewers Who:		
	Watch	Do Not Watch	$\chi^2(1)$	Watch	Do Not Watch	$\chi^2(1)$
Wide variety	94.6	88.6	3.68*	95.7	88.9	1.79
Physical challenge	84.8	73.0	7.02**	88.6	77.5	2.63
Proud experience	93.2	90.1	1.11	93.4	92.2	0.07
Step to college	60.0	57.6	2.69	65.1	57.7	0.80
Leadership skills	78.2	73.6	1.07	80.9	76.2	0.43
Working with high-tech equipment	71.3	63.0	2.71*	72.8	73.6	0.01
Aid to civilian career	92.5	87.7	2.21	95.7	91.4	0.90
Chance to develop self-confidence	92.2	86.5	2.78*	94.2	89.7	0.80
Chance to develop own potential	96.1	91.8	2.55	96.3	93.4	0.50
Mental challenge	85.0	81.2	0.94	86.0	80.3	0.75
Chance to become more mature	89.4	88.5	0.08	90.3	92.4	0.20
Useful skill training	89.6	86.1	0.98	94.8	88.4	1.55
High quality coworkers	83.1	80.4	0.44	83.3	82.9	0.00
Money for education	71.3	65.0	1.66	73.0	67.2	0.54
Serving your country	61.2	55.4	1.27	64.5	55.5	1.15
Serving in hometown	45.2	45.9	0.02	49.2	48.0	0.02
Exciting weekends	78.5	72.9	1.54	78.8	72.7	0.66
Serving part-time	41.2	41.5	0.00	38.6	45.2	0.61
Using own judgement	92.5	92.0	0.02	91.2	92.1	0.04

Note. Results are based on 1051 respondents for the full sample and 363 respondents for regular viewers.

* $p < .10$. ** $p < .05$.

showing virtually identical levels. Differences between viewers and nonviewers were significant for four attributes: physical challenge ($\chi^2=7.02$, $p<.05$); wide variety of jobs ($\chi^2=3.68$, $p<.10$); working with high-tech equipment ($\chi^2=2.71$, $p<.10$); and a chance to develop self-confidence ($\chi^2=2.78$, $p<.10$). When regular viewers were examined, the same pattern held for 15 of the 19 attributes, with the other four being lower for viewers than nonviewers. For all 19 attributes, however, none of the differences were significant. It appears, then, that these attributes are more important for those who watch the television show, but that for the most part this difference is not conclusive.

Summary and Discussion

A number of observations can be made concerning patterns of viewing of the television show "Tour of Duty" and characteristics of respondents who watch it. The following patterns can be seen:

- (1) Hours per week watching commercial television is slightly but significantly correlated with "Tour of Duty" for the full sample. Thus, those who watch a great deal of television are also more likely to watch "Tour of Duty".
- (2) Recall of Army advertising is not significantly associated with viewing "Tour of Duty". Unaided recall of Army advertising is higher among regular television viewers than for the full sample, although this may simply be due to regular viewers being a special population and watching more television.
- (3) The Army is viewed more positively by those who watch "Tour of Duty" than by those who do not. Due to the newness of the program, however, this is probably a case of self-selection rather than one of watching affecting perceptions.
- (4) The attributes examined appear to be more important to viewers of "Tour of Duty" than to nonviewers, although this difference is significant for only a limited number of attributes.
- (5) PMAS youth who watch "Tour of Duty" are significantly more likely to express both unaided and aided intent than are those who do not report watching the television show. Among PMAS youth who are regular television viewers this is true only for unaided intent.

The conclusions that can be made concerning "Tour of Duty" and the respondents who watch it are limited, due in large part to the fact that the program is simply too new. The show was introduced on television in the latter half of September, and was added to the ACOMS questionnaire on 1 October. Thus, some respondents were asked if they were regular viewers of a television show that, at that point, had

only been on the air once or twice. They may not have had a chance to develop an impression of the show to decide if it was worth watching.

The newness of the show may have much to do with the analytic results. The fact that analyses had to be conducted on only one quarter's worth of data resulted in comparatively small sample sizes, especially in the case of regular viewers. The larger standard errors which resulted from this made it more difficult for results to attain significance. This would also help explain why, for each of the analyses conducted, there were fewer significant differences among regular viewers than from the full sample. More definitive answers would require both a larger cross-sectional sample and a longitudinal analysis, to assess changes in attitudes of viewers over time. This longitudinal analysis would also allow respondents the chance to develop a more complete impression of "Tour of Duty".

Another possible area of future research lies in the use of the Orvis quality index. Although the problem of low sample size still exists, examining the "quality rating" of those who watch and those who do not watch "Tour of Duty", and correlating watching the program with quality might be instructive.

Reference

Greenlees, J. B. & Gaertner, G. H. Exposure to programs featuring Army advertising. (1988). In V. F. Nieva, G. H. Gaertner, T. W. Elig, & M. E. Benedict (Eds.). The Army Communications Objectives Measurement System (ACOMS): Annual report, school year 86/87. (ARI Technical Report 784). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.